

REMARKS


The claims have been amended to more clearly define the invention as disclosed in the written description. In particular, claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled, while claim 1 has been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claims 2 and 3. In addition, claims 15 and 16 have been amended to include the limitations of cancelled claim 3.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,751,354 to Foote et al. The Examiner has further rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 11, 13, 15 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0039203 A1 to Endo et al. In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,317,160 to Yoshida et al. The Examiner has moreover rejected claims 7-9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. in view of Yoshida et al. Finally, the Examiner has rejected claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foote et al. in view of U.S. Patent 5,243,418 to Kuno et al. Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner has found claims 3 and 4 allowable over the prior art of record.

In view of the above changes, Applicants believe that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. 102(b), 102(e) and 103(a) rejections of the claims have been overcome.

Applicants believe that this application, containing claims 1 and 4-16, is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

by 

Edward W. Goodman, Reg. 28,613

Attorney

Tel.: 914-333-9611